

United States Patent and Trademark Office

len

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	* ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,019	10/01/2003	Venkatachalam Eswarakrishnan	1796A1	9521
PPG INDUSTR	7590 01/08/2008 RIES, INC.	EXAMINER		
Intellectual Pro	perty Department	MAYEKAR, KISHOR		
One PPG Place Pittsburgh, PA 15272			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/677,019	ESWARAKRISHNAN ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Kishor Mayekar	1795		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)☐ 3)☐	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 No. This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,2,6-19,21-47,51 and 52 is/are pendida) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2,6-19,21-47,51 and 52 is/are reject Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Application	on Papers				
10) 🗌 🧵	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obje	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment		·			
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) lation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 29 November 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1, 23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitation "an aqueous medium" in the claim body is confusing as to its similar recitation in the claim preamble.

In claim 23, the recitation "an aqueous medium" in step (1) is confusing as to its similar recitation in the claim preamble and in step (5).

In claim 32, the recitation "an aqueous medium" in the claim body is confusing as to its similar recitation earlier claimed.

Application/Control Number:

10/677,019

Art Unit: 1795

Claim Rejections - 35 USC \$ 102 and 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 16-19, 23-27, 29-38 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 4. U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Eswarakrishnan et al. (US 5,630,922). Eswarakrishnan's invention is directed an electrodepositable coating composition containing diorganotin dicarboxylates. Eswarakrishnan discloses that the diorganotin dicarboxylate (or dialkyltin dicarboxylate) may be prepared by reacting the one or more different types of carboxylic compound, where at least one is the long chain carboxylic acid, with a diorganotin compound such as dialkyltin oxide (paragraphs 3 and 4 of col.7). In Example II-I, Eswarakrishnan discloses the diorganotin dicarboxylate is dioctyltin dioleate. Eswarakrishnan also discloses that the electrodepositable coating composition comprises the recited resinous phase (abstract and paragraph 4 of col. 5); the diorganotin dicarboxylate may be added to the final reaction mixture of the main vehicle, i.e., the active hydrogen-containing resin (paragraph 2 of col. 8 and Example B); and the electrodepositable coating composition is cured from 120° C to 190° C (paragraph 4 of col. 10) or at 171° C (or 341° F). It has been held that the disclosure in the prior art of any value within the claimed range is an anticipation of that

Application/Control Number:

10/677,019

Art Unit: 1795

range. And a prima facie case of obviousness exists in the case where the claimed range

overlaps range disclosed by the prior art, In re Wertheim 191 USPQ 90.

As to the subject matter of claims 19, 30 and 47, Eswarakrishnan discloses in the

abstract that the diorganotin dicarboxylate is present in an amount of at least 0.01

percent by weight of tin based on weight of total solids of the electrodepositable

composition.

Ass to the subject matter of claims 25 and 26, Eswarakrishnan's electrodepositable

composition inherently possesses it since it comprises the recited diorganotin

dicarboxylate.

5. Claims 11-15, 28 and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Eswarakrishnan '922 in view of Nishiguchi et al. (US 6,761,973 B2), a

reference cited in the last Office action. The difference between Eswarakrishnan as

applied above and the instant claims is the recited blocking agent. Nishiguchi teaches the

limitation in a cationic resin composition (see abstract). The subject matter as whole

would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have modified Eswarakrishnan's teachings as shown by Nishiguchi because the

selection of any of known equivalent blocking agents would be within the level of ordinary

skill in the art.

Page 5

Application/Control Number:

10/677,019

Art Unit: 1795

6. Claims 21, 22, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Eswarakrishnan '922 in view of Nishiguchi et al. (US 6,265,079 B1. The difference

between Eswarakrishnan as applied above and the instant claims is the recited coating

composition. Nishiguchi teaches the limitation in a cationic resin composition (see abstract

and paragraph 3 of col. 5). The subject matter as whole would have been within the level

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified

Eswarakrishnan's teachings as shown by Nishiguchi because this would result in a coating

with anticorrositivity without the use of lead compound.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8 November 2007 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive because of the new grounds of rejection as set forth in the paragraphs

above.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Page 6

Application/Control Number:

10/677,019

Art Unit: 1795

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN

USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kishor Mayekar Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1795